

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

John McCombs,  
Plaintiff,

C.A. No.: 8:10-cv-02406-RBH

vs.

**ORDER**

Ms. Holly Scaturo, SVPTP Director; Ms.  
S. Winston Woods, Program Manager;  
Ms. Shiela Lindsey, Admin. Asst.; Ms.  
Paula Prince, Job Assignment Supervisor;  
Ms. Amaker, Policy Writer; Mr. Bryant  
Morton, Activity Therapy Supervisor;  
Defendants.

Plaintiff, a person confined as a sexually violent predator, filed this action *pro se*. He is challenging what appears to be the Department of Mental Health equivalent of a custody level, access to a job and other privileges, and access to a law library. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in

part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions.  
See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that the above-captioned case is summarily dismissed without prejudice. Also, Plaintiff's motion for discovery [Entry No. 6] and Plaintiff's motion for law library access [Entry No. 7] are denied..

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
October 20, 2010

s/R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge